United Nations A/C.3/67/SR.47

General Assembly
Sixty-seventh session

Official Records

Distr.: General
29 January 2013

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 47th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 28 November 2012, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Mac-Donald ..... (Suriname)

Contents

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions related to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

(c) Follow-up to the International Year of Older Persons: Second World Assembly on Ageing (*continued*)

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 65: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

12-61267 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.3/67/L.11/Rev.1)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/67/L.8/Rev.1 and L.12/Rev.1)

(c) Social development: Follow-up to the International Year of Older Persons: Second World Assembly on Ageing (*continued*) (A/C.3/67/L.13/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.11/Rev.1: Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Chir** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the main sponsors and the Group of 77 and China, said that Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Portugal and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors. New text in the draft resolution mentioned the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) and the ministerial declaration adopted at the high-level segment of the substantive session of 2012 of the Economic and Social Council.

3. He made a minor editorial change to preambular paragraph 13 of the draft resolution.

4. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia and South Sudan had joined the sponsors.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.11/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

6. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her country was committed to accelerating progress toward the Millennium Development Goals by investing in national plans to boost agricultural development. The United States supported the continued attention in the text to the rights of indigenous peoples, but had voiced concerns with regard to previous versions of the draft resolution.

7. References to the global financial crisis were out of date. External threats to agriculture, such as natural disasters and trade distortion, were overemphasized, while domestic food security issues and the importance of creating a domestic enabling environment were not sufficiently stressed. Domestic policies played a critical role in providing opportunities and removing obstacles to economic growth.

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.8/Rev.1: Integrating volunteering in the next decade

8. **Mr. Hisajima** (Japan) said that Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors.

9. Reading out oral amendments to the draft resolution, he said that the new paragraph 6 should read: "Recognizes that an approach to volunteering may consider drawing on the notion of human security in accordance with all the provisions of General Assembly resolution 66/290, of 10 September 2012." In paragraph 9, "in particular" would be replaced by "particularly" and the phrase "the elaboration of future sustainable development goals" would be replaced by "giving appropriate consideration to the issue in the discussions of the post-2015 United Nations development agenda;".

10. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Haiti, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia, South Sudan, Tunisia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

11. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that her country's national literacy campaign in 1972 and its hurricane response activities demonstrated its support for volunteerism. Paragraph 6 of the draft resolution should be without prejudice to the provision contained

in General Assembly resolution 66/290 regarding future discussions of human security. Cuba would be in a better position to pursue such discussions following the release of the report of the Secretary-General requested in the draft resolution.

12. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that it was premature and irresponsible to incorporate mention of human security into any resolution. Forcing the issue weakened the balance of understandings that had been reached. The mention should not serve as a precedent. The concept of human security should not be incorporated until such time as it enjoyed consensus-based agreement.

13. **Ms. Wilson** (Jamaica) said that the discussions ongoing in another forum on the United Nations development agenda beyond 2015 should not be prejudged.

14. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.8/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

15. **Mr. Nebenzi** (Russian Federation) said that a number of provisions contained in the draft resolution were of no practical significance for the work of volunteers. The concept of human security was unlikely to bring anything fundamentally new to volunteer activity, and the attempt to introduce the concept through the draft resolution was counterproductive.

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.12/Rev.1: Preparations for and observance of the twentieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family

16. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

17. **Mr. Chir** (Algeria), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that Turkey had joined the sponsors. The current draft resolution emphasized poverty eradication, full employment and decent work, work/life balance, social integration and intergenerational solidarity.

18. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Russian Federation and Uzbekistan had joined the sponsors.

19. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted.*

20. **Mr. Makriyiannis** (Cyprus), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that family policies must be inclusive in order to be successful. Family structures had changed, and it was necessary to continue recognizing that diversity, as had been done at the United Nations conferences and summits in the 1990s and during the follow-up processes. Ongoing policy discussion and development should continue to reflect the diversity of family forms. All references to the family in the draft resolution in question were therefore understood as reflecting that diversity. Support for an inclusive approach was increasing.

21. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that different family structures shared the common trait of providing a nurturing environment. The draft resolution should have contained specific references to various forms of the family.

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.13/Rev.1: Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing

22. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

23. **Mr. Chir** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Malta, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and the United States of America had joined the sponsors.

24. **Mr. Tegos** (Greece), speaking on a point of order, recalled that Security Council resolution 817 (1993) recommended the provisional use of the term "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" to refer to the State in question pending settlement of the difference that had arisen over the name of the State. All States were therefore requested to use the proper name of that country.

25. **Mr. Chir** (Algeria) said that the current draft resolution recommended that the situation of older persons be taken into account in ongoing efforts to achieve internationally agreed development goals.

26. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Monaco, Montenegro, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Ukraine and the United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors.

27. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*) (A/C.3/67/L.71)

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.71: Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly

28. **Ms. Šćepanović** (Vice-Chair) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the Chair of the Committee.

29. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.71 was adopted.*

31. **Mr. Chir** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that obstacles to the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly remained. Responsibility for implementation lay primarily at the national level.

32. **The Chair**, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, suggested that the Committee should take note of the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women on its forty-ninth, fiftieth and fifty-first sessions (A/67/38) and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women (A/67/227).

33. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/67/L.61)

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.61: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

34. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

35. **Ms. Farngalo** (Liberia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the African Group, said that by late 2011, Africa had become host to approximately one quarter of the world's refugees, many of whom were women and children. The draft resolution highlighted the burden and experience of the African States in hosting refugees and addressing issues related to returnees and displaced persons.

36. Australia, Chile, Croatia, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland and Italy had joined the sponsors.

37. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.61 was adopted.*

39. **Mr. Makriyiannis** (Cyprus), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that a more transparent and inclusive consultation process would have provided the opportunity to strengthen the resolution and garner the sponsorship of more member States of the European Union.

Agenda item 65: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/67/L.23/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.23/Rev.1: Rights of the child

40. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, made reference to the mandate of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children, which would be funded from the regular budget starting from the biennium 2014-2015. In that connection, he drew the attention of the Third Committee to the provisions of section IV of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which was resolution 66/246, in which the General Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with the responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

41. During the biennium 2012-2013, the core activities and mandate of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the current biennium would continue to be funded through voluntary contributions. The Secretary-General would have to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the scope and details of regular budget resources needed for the effective performance of the mandate and the sustainability of the core activities of the Special Representative as requested in the draft resolution. The estimated resource requirements would be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 and would be reviewed in accordance with established procedures.

42. Adoption of the draft resolution would therefore entail no additional requirements under the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/67/L.58)

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.58: Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

43. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

44. **Ms. Asticsarán Arias** (Cuba) said that Belarus, the Congo, Ghana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malaysia, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, the Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors. The current draft resolution expressed grave concern with regard to human rights violations involving mercenaries and employees of private military and security companies, including summary executions, forced disappearances, torture and rape.

45. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Dominican Republic, the Gambia, Mauritania, Somalia and Uganda had joined the sponsors.

46. **Mr. Makriyiannis** (Cyprus) speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the Third Committee and the Human Rights Council were not the proper forums for addressing mercenary activity. Such matters should not be approached primarily from the standpoint of human rights and the threat to the right of self-determination.

47. Private military and security companies should not be included in the draft resolution. Such entities must be properly regulated and held accountable for breaches of international law. It would be false and misleading to equate mercenaries and employees of private military and security companies. Regulation of private military and security companies was related to several branches of international law, including law on the use of force, international humanitarian law, human rights law, States' responsibility and international criminal law. In the absence of an understanding on important definitions and approaches, the member States of the European Union would vote against the draft resolution.

48. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.58.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Colombia, Fiji, Mexico, Switzerland.

49. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.58 was adopted by 122 votes to 52, with 5 abstentions.*

50. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina) said that his Government supported the right of colonized peoples to self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which stated that that right existed only where there was an active subject in the form of a people living under alien subjugation, domination and exploitation. All General Assembly resolutions since resolution 2065 (XX) and the annual resolutions of the Special Committee on decolonization on the question of the Malvinas Islands recognized the existence of a sovereignty dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom, which should be resolved through bilateral negotiations. The United Kingdom had illegitimately occupied the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas, had expelled the Argentine population and had replaced it with United Kingdom subjects. Hence it was not the right to self-determination which applied to the situation but the principle of territorial integrity.

51. **Ms. Walker** (United Kingdom) said that her Government had no doubts about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and the surrounding maritime areas, and attached great importance to the principle of self-determination as set out in the Charter of the United Nations and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which underpinned its position on the Islands. Sovereignty negotiations would not be possible without the islanders' agreement. Their democratically elected representatives had clearly expressed their views at the 2012 session of the Special Committee on decolonization, at which they had requested recognition of their right to self-determination, reiterating the historical fact that the islands had had no indigenous inhabitants and that no civilian population had been removed before the arrival of the islanders, who were the only people of the Falkland Islands and wanted no change in the Islands' status.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/67/L.27/Rev.1, A/C.3/67/L.32/Rev.1*, A/C.3/67/L.33 and A/C.3/67/L.39)

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.27/Rev.1: United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region

52. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that, with regard to the request in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution for the Secretary-General to provide regular budget resources to the United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region from 2014-2015, the attention of the Committee was drawn to section 4 of General Assembly resolution 45/248b and subsequent resolutions, in which the General Assembly had reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was responsible for administrative and budgetary matters, and had confirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

53. The Centre's activities in 2012-2013 would be funded through voluntary contributions. Meanwhile, the Secretary-General would assess the regular budget resources needed for the performance of the Centre's mandate, as requested in the draft resolution. The estimated requirements would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2014-2015 and would be reviewed by the intergovernmental bodies.

54. The request in paragraph 6 was expected to require the production by the Department of General Assembly and Conference Management of one 8,500-word document in the official languages, for which provision had not been made in the programme budget for 2012-2013. If the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution, therefore, additional requirements of $50,900 would arise under section 2, but every effort would be made to absorb those requirements within existing resources and to report thereon in the second performance report for 2012-2013.

55. **Mr. Laram** (Qatar) said that Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Egypt, Grenada, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen had become sponsors of the draft resolution. Following consultations with the Member States, his delegation had reflected in the text requests for regular budget funding for the Centre to start in 2014-2015. The adoption of the draft resolution would be a landmark in the Centre's ability to fulfil its mandate; political changes in the region had confirmed the need for a specialized body meeting the need for human rights capacity-building. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

56. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Cameroon, the Comoros, the Philippines and Somalia had joined the sponsors.

57. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

58. **Mr. Laram** (Qatar) asked which delegation had requested the recorded vote.

59. **The Chair** said that the vote had been requested by the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic.

60. **Ms. Alsaleh** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation was surprised that the Qatari Government was seeking to finance the Centre from the regular budget despite the financial crisis at the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Regular budget funding would run counter to General Assembly resolution 60/153 on the establishment of the Centre, which stipulated that it should be funded through voluntary contributions.

61. Her Government had monitored the Centre's activities since its creation and did not believe that they justified regular budget funding. The Centre was not functioning as a regional centre, but had instead been used by the Qatari Government to support non-governmental organizations and opposition groups in the region.

62. The Qatari delegation had violated Third Committee and General Assembly procedure, since it should have submitted the draft resolution to the Fifth Committee. Her delegation advised the Qatari Government to reduce its funding of terrorist groups in the Syrian Arab Republic so that it could finance the Centre without resorting to the regular budget. Her delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

63. Ms. Robl (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that institutions such as the Centre were important to countries in political transition and thanked Qatar for its commitment to human rights capacity-building. Her delegation supported the Centre's work but was disappointed that the draft resolution could not be adopted by consensus. It would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

64. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.27/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland,

Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against:

Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Indonesia, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

65. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted by 149 votes to 1, with 17 abstentions.*[1]

66. **Mr. Makriyiannis** (Cyprus), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union agreed that regional cooperation was fundamental to the promotion of human rights and therefore welcomed the start of training and regional consultation at the Centre. It noted the assessment of the High Commissioner on Human Rights that recent developments in the Middle East and North Africa had generated both growing demand for the Centre's activities and concerns about the Centre's capacity to meet that demand.

67. With regard to United Nations resources, the European Union's aim was to maintain the stability of the regular budget, promote best practices and reduce spending. It welcomed the clarification of the analysis required before regular budget funding could start, and would appreciate further assessment of the Centre's work. Alternative means of funding, such as cost-sharing and voluntary contributions, should be considered. His delegation asked for those factors to be included in the considerations outlined by the Secretariat for the biennium 2014-2015. The European Union was committed to human rights and would continue to examine how the Centre's mandate could be strengthened. The European Union and its member States had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution.

68. **Mr. Hisajima** (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution. Although it recognized the importance of the Centre, it was cautious about approving regular budget expenditure in the current climate, favouring voluntary contributions instead.

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.32/Rev.1: Human rights and extreme poverty*

69. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

70. **Mr. Thornberry** (Peru) said that the draft resolution had been updated to include a reference to the guiding principles on extreme poverty and human rights adopted by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 21/11. His delegation was convinced of the close relationship between the fight against extreme poverty and the exercise of human rights, and hoped that the draft resolution would allow people in extreme poverty to enjoy those rights.

71. Bulgaria, China, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Japan, Latvia, Malta, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had become sponsors of the draft resolution. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

72. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Burundi, Cameroon, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Estonia, the Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Honduras, Liberia, Malaysia, Norway, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Suriname, Tunisia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

73. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.32/Rev.1* was adopted.*

[1] The delegation of Indonesia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

74. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that although the Guiding Principles on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights were useful to States in the formulation of poverty eradication programmes, her delegation disagreed with certain interpretations of human rights law contained in those Principles. It had therefore joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that it did not imply that States should implement obligations under instruments to which they were not parties. Her delegation recognized no change in existing law as a result of its approval of the draft resolution, and understood the reaffirmation of various instruments to apply only to States which had already adhered to them. It also felt that the references to a global food crisis were inaccurate. Although the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) had issued warnings about regional crises and price volatility, it had emphasized that the situation did not equate to a global food crisis.

75. **Mr. Ruidiaz** (Chile) said that the draft resolution had taken note with appreciation of the Guiding Principles as useful to States in formulating poverty eradication policies. Following the financial crisis, States should not adopt measures which infringed the rights of those living in extreme poverty. The Guiding Principles should be considered as global political guidelines which applied States' human rights obligations to the specific situation of people in extreme poverty. His delegation encouraged the application of those guidelines by the United Nations, intergovernmental bodies and non-governmental organizations.

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.33: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

76. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

77. **Mr. Selim** (Egypt) said that Angola, the Congo, India, Mauritania, Saint Lucia, Togo, Rwanda and Zambia had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. The large number of sponsors proved that the international community was aware of the great challenges and opportunities of globalization. Its balance, however, did not favour developing countries and made it harder for them to protect human rights. Although the aim of the draft resolution was to address the situation, certain delegations had refused to discuss fundamental problems in the text with the sponsors. They looked forward to more engagement during future consultations that would allow future related draft resolutions to be adopted by consensus.

78. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Dominican Republic, the Gambia and the Philippines had joined the sponsors.

79. **Mr. Constantinou** (Cyprus), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the European Union acknowledged that globalization could affect the full enjoyment of some human rights but that its impact should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The draft resolution, however, generalized the problem by claiming that globalization had an impact on all human rights.

80. The European Union also felt that the draft resolution focused almost exclusively on the negative aspects of globalization and ignored the positive ones. Globalization could offer means of addressing acute problems such as extreme poverty. European Union member States would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

81. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.33.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian

Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

82. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.33 was adopted by 128 votes to 53.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.39: The right to development

83. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

84. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, said that China had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

85. She read out a number of oral amendments to the text. The seventeenth preambular paragraph should be deleted. Paragraphs 2 and 5 should be deleted and replaced by a new paragraph 2 reading "Endorses the conclusions and recommendations adopted by consensus by the Working Group on the Right to Development of the Human Rights Council at its eleventh session, and, while reaffirming them, calls for their immediate, full and effective implementation by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and other relevant actors, noting also the efforts under way within the framework of the Working Group with a view to complementing the tasks entrusted to it by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 4/4". At the end of paragraph 3, the words "with the recognition that the Working Group will convene annual sessions of five working days and submit its report to the Council" should be added, thus restoring the wording agreed by the Committee in 2011. The first line of paragraph 8 should be replaced with the words "Encourage Member States and relevant stakeholders when submitting views on the work of the high-level task force".

86. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that El Salvador and Senegal had also joined the sponsors.

87. **Mr. Ansari Dogaheh** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, said that the right to development and self-determination, respect for sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs and the prevention of violence were essential to peace and friendly relations, as set out in the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation believed in a constructive approach to the promotion of human rights and the equal treatment of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.

88. The Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement had reaffirmed at their 2012 summit the need to promote human rights through international dialogue and to ensure the realization of the right to development. They had also reaffirmed the objective of making that right a reality as set out in the Millennium Declaration, and had decided to consider the negative impact of coercive measures which affected that right.

89. A new human order was needed to reverse the growing disparities between rich and poor through poverty eradication, full employment, decent work and social integration. Developing economies had been severely affected by the financial crisis, which had had a negative impact on the right to development. The crisis should therefore be addressed in order to promote development through sustained economic growth, poverty eradication and sustainable

development. States should foster efforts to fight extreme poverty and hunger in line with Millennium Development Goal 1 and participation by the poorest in decision-making. The United Nations should ensure that the right to development was upheld, including through the elaboration of a convention.

90. His delegation called on the United Nations to mainstream the right to development in its activities and in the strategies of international financial trading systems, taking into account that the economic principles of equity, non-discrimination, transparency, accountability, participation and international cooperation were indispensable to the right to development and the prevention of discriminatory treatment of matters of concern to developing countries.

91. The draft resolution was an attempt to meet the development aspirations of the Non-Aligned Movement. Since the Movement had shown flexibility in accommodating different views, it looked forward to more cooperation with interested partners. It regretted the fact that certain delegations had called for a vote and hoped that the Member States would in future be more flexible in order to achieve consensus.

92. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her Government was the biggest bilateral donor of overseas assistance and recognized that development depended on political leaders and institutions in developing countries. Progress was possible where political leaders governed responsibly, but was difficult otherwise, regardless of the international community's engagement. Development goals would be achieved through the promotion of the rights set out in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights; economic goals should be pursued taking account of development and environmental needs.

93. Her delegation would vote against the draft resolution because it did not represent consensus on the best way to achieve development goals. Resolutions on the right to development should not include unrelated material on controversial topics being addressed elsewhere. Her delegation was not in favour of a binding international agreement on the matter and therefore could not support the current wording. Discussion of the right to development should focus on universal rights which individuals could demand from Governments; that concern was not reflected in the draft resolution.

94. As her delegation had stated in the discussions of the Working Group on the Right to Development and the Human Rights Council, the indicators produced by the high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development should be taken into account before changes to the work of the task force were considered. Her delegation would, however, continue to engage with the Working Group in order to move forward.

95. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.39.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania,

Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine.

96. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.39 was adopted by 147 votes to 4, with 28 abstentions.*

97. **Ms. Lau** (Canada) said that her Government supported the Declaration on the Right to Development but was concerned by the notion of a legally binding instrument and felt that the international community should focus on helping individuals fulfil their development potential. Her delegation had therefore voted against the draft resolution.

98. **Ms. Walker** (United Kingdom) said that her Government was committed to the right to development and was a major donor of development assistance. The delegation of Cuba had made various improvements to the text but her delegation's major substantive concern had not been addressed. A lack of development in a particular country was not a pretext for curtailing human rights. Although individual States were responsible for protecting their citizens, no such obligation existed between States. Her Government would continue to engage with the Working Group on the Right to Development, although in its view the Working Group's efforts should not lead to a binding international legal standard. The right to development should evolve consensually, without politicization, and on the basis of respect for civil, political, economic and cultural rights. Her delegation had therefore voted against the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.